



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,014	10/03/2003	David V. Goeddel	P0960R1D1C3	8921
23552	7590	04/18/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			BOESEN, AGNIESZKA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/679,014

Applicant(s)

GOEDEL ET AL.

Examiner

Agnieszka Boesen

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's letter, filed March 17, 2006, inquiring about the status of the instant application is acknowledged.

Claims 1-38 are pending and are subject to the following restriction.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12, and 37, drawn to an isolated I-TRAF polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

If group I is elected, Applicant is further required to elect **one** amino acid sequence:

- a) SEQ ID NO: 1,
 - b) SEQ ID NO: 5, or
 - c) SEQ ID NO: 6.
- II. Claims 13-18, drawn to an isolated nucleic acid, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- III. Claims 19 and 20 drawn to an antibody capable of specific binding to an I-TRAF polypeptide, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.

Art Unit: 1648

- IV. Claim 21, drawn to a method of using a nucleic acid, comprising expressing nucleic acid molecule in a cultured host cell, classified in class 435, subclass 455.
- V. Claim 22, drawn to a method of producing an I-TRAF polypeptide, comprising inserting into the DNA of a cell a transcription modulatory element, classified in class 435, subclass 455.
- VI. Claims 23-36, drawn to an assay for identifying a molecule capable of modulating the association of an I-TRAF and a TRAF, classified in class 435, subclass 7.95.
- VII. Claims 35 and 36, drawn to a method of treating a tumor associated with Epstein-Barr virus, comprising administering to a patient a therapeutically effective amount of an I-TRAF classified in class 435, subclass 230.1.
- VIII. Claim 38, drawn to a method of modulating TRAF-mediated signal transduction in a cell comprising introducing into said cell a nucleic acid, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The polypeptides of group I and isolated nucleic acid of group II are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct

Art Unit: 1648

molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of group II does not necessarily encode a polypeptide of group I. For example, as disclosed in the specification, SEQ ID NO: 1 is 413 amino acids in length, whereas the nucleic acid molecule of SEQ ID NO: 4 is only 170 nucleotides in length (which would encode at most a polypeptide of 55 amino acids in length). Furthermore, the information provided by the nucleic acid of group II can be used to make a materially different polypeptide than that of group I. In addition, while a polypeptide of group I can be made by methods using some, but not all, of the nucleic acids that fall within the scope of group II, it can also be recovered from a natural source using by biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, the inventions of groups I and II are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of groups I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides is not coextensive. The inventions of groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers which had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Therefore searching the nucleic acids and polypeptides, is not coextensive. The scope of nucleic acids as claimed extends beyond the polynucleotide that encodes the claimed polypeptides as explained above; furthermore, a search of the nucleic acid molecules of group II would require an oligonucleotide search, which

Art Unit: 1648

is not likely to result in relevant art with respect to the polypeptides of group. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of groups I and II together. Additionally searching the literature regarding all polypeptide sequences together would be burdensome and it would require searching commercial and non-patent literature databases. Thus groups I and II are properly restricted based on being independent or distinct and having a burdensome search requirement.

The polypeptide of group I and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons: While the inventions of both group I and group III are polypeptides, in this instance the polypeptide of group I is a single chain molecule that functions as an enzyme, whereas the polypeptide of group III encompasses antibodies including IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus the polypeptide of group I and the antibody of group III are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polypeptide of group I and an antibody of group III is dependent upon the correlation between the scope of the polypeptides that the antibody binds and the scope of the antibodies that would be generated upon immunization with the polypeptide.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of group I and group III would impose a serious search burden. The inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A polypeptide and an antibody which production is induced as result of the immunization with the polypeptide require different searches. An amino acid sequence

Art Unit: 1648

search of the full-length protein is necessary for a determination of novelty and unobviousness of the protein. However, such a search is not required to identify the antibodies of group III. In addition, the technical literature searches for the polypeptide of group I and the antibody of group III are not coextensive, e.g., antibodies may be characterized in the technical literature prior to discovery of or sequence of their binding target.

The nucleic acid of group II and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons. The antibody of group III includes, for example, IgG molecules which comprise 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs). Polypeptides, such as the antibody of group III which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of nucleic acids, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a nucleic acid of group II will not encode an antibody of group III, and the antibody of group III cannot be encoded by a polynucleotide of group II. Therefore the antibody and polynucleotide are patentably distinct.

The antibody and nucleic acid inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Furthermore, searching the inventions of group II and group III would impose a serious search burden since a search of the nucleic acid of group II would not be used to determine the patentability of an antibody of group III and vice-versa.

Art Unit: 1648

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Inventions I and V are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case polypeptide as claimed can be made by another materially different process other than a method comprising inserting into the DNA of a cell containing nucleic acid encoding the polypeptide a transcription modulatory element.

Inventions I and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of group I can be used to immunize an animal to induce an antibody production, as opposed to being used in an assay for identifying a molecule capable of modulating the association of an I-TRAF.

Inventions I and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the

Art Unit: 1648

product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of group I can be used to immunize an animal to induce an antibody production, as opposed to being used in a method of treating a tumor associated with Epstein-Barr virus, comprising administering to a patient a therapeutically effective amount of I-TRAF polypeptide.

Inventions (I, III) and (IV, VIII) are unrelated because the products of groups (I, III) are not used or otherwise involved in the process of group (IV, VIII). In the instant case, the different inventions, the polypeptide of group I and the antibody of group III are not disclosed as being used in the method of modulating TRAF-mediated signal transduction in a cell comprising introducing into said cell a nucleic acid or the a method of using a nucleic acid.

Inventions II and (IV, VIII) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid of group II can be used in the method of amplifying the DNA such as PCR reaction, as opposed to being used in a method wherein the nucleic acid is expressed in a cultured host cell, or in a method of modulating TRAF-mediated signal transduction.

Inventions (II, III) and (V, VI, VII) are unrelated because the product of group II are not used or otherwise involved in the process of group (V, VI, VII). In the instant case, the nucleic acid of group II is not disclosed as being used in the method of modulating TRAF-mediated signal transduction, a method of identifying a molecule capable of modulating the association of an I-TRAF and a TRAF, or the method of treating a tumor associated with Epstein-Barr virus.

Inventions IV, V, VI, VI, VII, and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). The instant specification does not disclose that these methods would be used together. The method of using a nucleic acid, the method of producing an I-TRAF polypeptide, the method of identifying a molecule capable of modulating the association of an I-TRAF and a TRAF, the method of treating a tumor associated with Epstein-Barr virus and a method of modulating TRAF-mediated signal transduction are all unrelated as they comprise distinct steps and utilize different products which demonstrates that each method has a different mode of operation. Each invention performs this function using a structurally and functionally divergent material. Moreover, the methodology and materials necessary for producing a polypeptide differ significantly from the method of treating a tumor associated with Epstein-Barr virus or a method of modulating TRAF-mediated signal transduction. Therefore, each method is divergent in materials and steps. For these reasons the inventions IV, V, VI, VI, VII, and VIII are patentably distinct. Furthermore, the distinct steps and products require separate and distinct searches. The inventions of groups

Art Unit: 1648

IV, V, VI, VI, VII, and VIII have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. As such, it would be burdensome to search all inventions together.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search required for each group is not required for the other groups because each group requires a different non-patent literature search due to each group comprising different products and/or method steps, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Notice of Possible Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Art Unit: 1648

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Agnieszka Boesen whose telephone number is 571-272-8035. The examiner can normally be reached on M – F (9:00AM – 5:30PM). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB

Agnieszka Boesen, Ph.D.

April 14, 2006

 4/17/06

JAMES HOUSEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600